REMARKS

By the present Amendment, new claim 7 has been added consistent with the description provided in the application, particularly on page 7. The independent claim has not been amended since applicants believe that the claim is patentable over the cited prior art of record.

The metal laminates of the present invention are prepared from a layer of a resin composition obtained by compounding a bismaleimide compound represented by defined formula (1) in a polyamic acid and/or a polyimide that is applied on one or both sides of a metal foil layer (which is further defined in claim 7 as having a thickness of not greater than 150 μm). The bismaleimide compound includes the provision that the substitution position is in the meta-position and the Declaration submitted with previous response demonstrates that the laminate with the defined bismaleimide provides superior peel strength relative to a similar laminate which does not include the defined bismaleimide with the recited meta-position. In addition, as described in the paragraph bridging pages 24 and 25 of the specification, the metal laminates can provide high "solder heat resistance" with specific illustrations being set forth in Table 2 on page 35.

The prior art combination relied on by the Examiner would not lead to the presently claimed invention or an appreciation of the superior results which can be obtained therefrom. In particular, neither Yamaya et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,987,207, nor Matsuura et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,508,357, discloses or suggests the claimed metal laminates with the defined bismaleimide and neither patent in any way recognizes the importance of the defined polymaleimide of formula (1) which

specifies that X or N has a substitution position of meta to that of another X or N that is bonded to the same benzene ring in order to provide improved peel strength.

The Examiner's reference in the Official Action to glass plates and metal plates in Yamaya et al. is misplaced. Such plate materials are described in the paragraph starting at column 5, line 44 as a casting mechanism to form a free film. In particular, the first two sentences of this paragraph read:

> The resin composition of the invention can be used as prepregs by having base materials such as glass cloths, carbon cloths or the like impregnated therewith, followed by drying. As an alternative, the resin composition can be cast and dried on a glass plate, stainless steel plate or the like so that it can be used as a film-like adhesive **free of any base material** for various applications. (emphasis added)

With regard to the application of the disclosed composition onto steel sheets in the Examples (e.g., see column 6, lines 50-60), it is for the determination of tensile shear strength, not the formation of a laminate with a metal foil as in the present invention which can be used for such functions as a chip-on-film as discussed in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the present application.

The Examiner has conceded that Yamaya et al. does not disclose the claimed laminate and has therefore further relied on Matsuura et al. to show metal foil laminates. However, Matsuura et al. seeks to provide a polyimide having excellent solubility in organic solvents and a low softening point, as well as a composition which can be molded, extruded or cured at low temperatures. As such, it will be evident to those of ordinary skill in the art that the respective patents have different objects and thus provide different compositions. If one were to attempt to try to use the resin of Yamaya et al. in place of the resin in Matsuura et al., it is not ensured that the desired characteristics of excellent solubility and low softening point can be obtained. Thus, those of ordinary skill in the art would not attempt to substitute one

resin for the other. Conversely, it would not be obvious to attempt to use the resin of Yamaya et al. with a metal foil since the patent does not indicate that such utility would provide good adhesion, particularly with a foil having a thickness recited in claim 7. In this regard, the Examiner is respectfully reminded that "obvious to try" is not the standard under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In the Official Action, the Examiner additionally dismissed the superior results demonstrated in the aforementioned Declaration by stating that Yamaya et al. does disclose a bismaleimide compound linked at the meta-position. Applicants respectfully maintain that the Examiner cannot dismiss the results on this basis. The rejections are based on "obviousness" under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, all evidence addressed to the issue of "obviousness" is of relevance. Moreover, there is nothing in Yamaya et al. which would lead those of ordinary skill in the art to only the embodiments in Examples 16 and 17. In fact, considering the tensile shear strengths provided in Table 1 of Yamaya et al., there are embodiments which have superior strengths than those of Examples 16 and 17. Accordingly, since there is nothing to lead those of ordinary skill in the art to these embodiments and there are reasons why such individuals would not select these embodiments, applicants respectfully submit that the evidence of record clearly supports the patentability of the claims of record.

For all the reasons provided above, applicants respectfully maintain that the combination of the cited patents cannot be used to reject the claims of record, particularly in light of the technical evidence that has been presented and therefore request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the subject application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

By: _____
Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-662

Date: August 16, 2006